

Or
interface circuitry that assists in delivering the plurality of coded images to the [host] processing circuit from the remote capture unit for decoding after the plurality of coded images have been stored in the image buffer.--

CB
15. (Amended) A coded image capture and decoding system comprising:

a remote capture unit comprising:

an image buffer that stores a plurality of images representative of a coded target;

and

a host image processing unit operably coupled to the remote capture unit, the host image processing unit comprising:

a [host] processing circuit [, operably coupled to the image buffer, that performs decode processing]; [and]

code processing circuitry, communicatively coupled to the processing circuit, [that] selectively [directs] directing the [host] processing circuit to decode the plurality of coded images.

REMARKS

Applicants have reviewed the final Office Action of June 18, 1999. In response, Applicants respectfully request entry of this amendment in reconsideration of the application in light of the foregoing amendment and following remarks. Claims 1-18 are pending. Claims 1, 8, and 15 are presented for amendment. Applicants submit that the amendments place the application in condition for allowance or in better form for appeal so that entry of the amendment is proper.

Claims 1-18 are pending. Claims 1-2, 4-6, 8-9, 12, 14, and 15-17 presently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Feng, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,783,811). Claims 3, 13, and 18 presently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly met by Feng in view of the admitted prior art. Claims 7 and 10-11 presently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly met by Feng in view of Park (U.S. Patent No. 5,675,424).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1-2, 4-6, 8-9, 12, 14, and 15-17, as rewritten, under 35 U.S.C. §102 as allegedly met by Feng.

Applicants respectfully object to the characterization of the cited prior art as capable of decoding a plurality of independently stored images after the plurality of images have been stored in an image buffer. The cited art only contains a reference to the decoding of a single image at a time after the image has been stored. The cited art does not allow for multiple images to be decoded after storage of all the multiple images.

However, in the interests of furthering prosecution, Applicants have amended the claims. These amendments are made solely to more precisely point out the invention, and are made solely for the sake of clarifying the invention.

Rewritten claim 1 recites, among others, a remote capture unit with a first processing circuit, coupled to the optical system, that generates a plurality of images based on image data received from the optical system. Additionally, rewritten claim 1 recites a host system having a second processing circuit coupled to the image buffer. After the plurality of images are stored in the image buffer, the second processor attempts decode processing of the plurality of images.

Feng does not recite, nor does it suggest, a “a remote capture unit” having “a first processing circuit, coupled to the optical system, that generates a plurality of images based on image data received from the optical system” and “a host system” having “a second processing

circuit, coupled to the image buffer, that, after the plurality of images are stored in the image buffer, attempts decode processing of the plurality of images”, among others. As such, among other reasons, the rejection of claim 1, as currently rewritten, is respectfully traversed.

Claims 2 and 4-6, rejected under §102 in light of Feng, are dependent upon claim 1. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of claims 2 and 4-6 over Feng, since these claims are dependent on an allowable base claim, among other reasons.

Independent Claim 8, as rewritten, recites, among other items, a remote capture unit that has an image processing circuit that generates a plurality of coded images. The remote capture unit also has an image buffer that stores the plurality of coded images generated by the image processing circuit. The capture and decode system also contains a host unit which has a processing circuit. The processing circuit performs decode processing of the coded images.

Feng neither recites or suggests the invention in claim 8, as rewritten. Feng does not disclose or suggest a “remote capture unit” that has an “image processing circuit that generates a plurality of coded images”, and “an image buffer ... that stores the plurality of coded images generated by the image processing circuit[.]” and a “host unit” that contains a “processing circuit that performs decode processing of coded images[.]”

Claims 8-9, 12, and 14, rejected under §102 in light of Feng, are dependent upon claim 8. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of claims 8-9, 12, and 14 in light of Feng, since these claims are dependent on an allowable base claim, among other reasons.

Relatedly, claim 15, as rewritten, is directed to an image capture system having, among other items, a remote capture unit. The remote capture unit has an image buffer that stores a plurality of images representative of a coded target. The remote capture unit works with a host

image processing unit that has a processing circuit. This processing circuit selectively decodes the plurality of coded images.

Feng does not recite an image capture system having “a remote capture unit” having “an image buffer that stores a plurality of images representative of a coded target” working with a “host image processing unit” having “a processing circuit” that “decode[s] the plurality of coded images.” Nor does Feng suggest this invention.

Claims 16 and 17, rejected under §102 in light of Feng, are dependent upon claim 15. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of claims 16 and 17 in light of Feng, since these claims are dependent on an allowable base claim, among other reasons.

Accordingly, the claims 1-2, 4-6, 8-9, 12, 14, and 15-17 are allowable over Feng. Applicants accordingly request withdrawal of these rejections. Further, as claims 1, 8, and 15 are independent claims, all depending claims should be allowed as depending upon allowable claims, as well as in consideration of the additional items each dependent claim recites.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of claims 3, 13, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly met by Feng in view of the admitted prior art. The admitted prior art is insufficient to overcome the deficiencies of Feng.

First, Applicants object to the mischaracterization of the admitted prior art. The admitted prior art shows that a predefined number of failed decoding attempts may trigger the end of an attempt at decoding the image. This has nothing to do with predefined number of images making up the totality of the number of images buffered. Thus, equating a predefined number of failed decoding attempts to end an attempt to decode an image to the “storing of a plurality of images, where[] the plurality of images constitutes a predetermined number of images” is not proper.

Claim 3 further recites that the “plurality of images constitutes a predetermined number of images.” As noted before, Applicants respectfully assert that the cited prior art is mischaracterized in this respect. As such, admitted prior art does not teach, nor does it suggest the element of “the plurality of images constitut[ing] a predetermined number of images.” Thus, the Office Action fails to make a prima facie case for obviousness under §103.

Additionally, independent claim 1, as rewritten, is believed allowable over Feng, and as such, dependent claim 3 is also believed allowable. The admitted prior art, even if taken at face value as stated in the Office Action, does not make up the missing portions of Feng, nor does it suggest to do so.

Relatedly, claim 13 recites that “the image processing circuit attempts to generate a predetermined number of coded images.” This rejection, in equating an “image processing circuit attempt[ing] to generate a predetermined number of coded images” to a predefined number of failed decoding attempts, is respectfully traversed. The admitted prior art does not teach, nor does it suggest the element of “the plurality of images constitut[ing] a predetermined number of images.” As with Claim 3, a prima facie case of obviousness has not been made in the Office Action for Claim 13.

Additionally, independent claim 8, as rewritten, is believed allowable over Feng, and as such, dependent claim 13 is also believed allowable. The admitted prior art, even if taken at face value as stated in the Office Action, does not make up the missing portions of Feng, nor does it suggest to do so.

Claim 18 recites that “the interface circuitry utilizes wireless transmissions in the delivery of the plurality of images to the host processing circuit” for decoding by the host processing circuit. The Office Action asserts that multiple images are wirelessly transferred to a remote site

for further processing, based on the admitted prior art. However, the prior art does not make up the deficiencies of Feng, nor does it suggest to do so.

Accordingly, Claims 3, 13, and 18 are allowable over Feng in view of the cited prior art . Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of these rejections.


Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of claims 7 and 10-11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly met by Feng in view of Park (U.S. Patent No. 5,675,424). Park is also insufficient to overcome the deficiencies of Feng, as stated above, among other reasons.

Accordingly, Claims 7, 10, and 11 are allowable over Feng in view of Park, and Applicants request withdrawal of these rejections.

In view of the above remarks, and for various other reasons, Applicants submit that all of the claims are in a condition for allowance. As such, Applicants solicit a Notice of Allowability for all claims.

August 18, 1999

Respectfully submitted,



J. Davis Gilmer
Registration No. P-44,711